

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **8 December 2005**, the examiner reviewed claims 1, 3-8, 10-15, and 17-21. Claims 1, 3-8, 10-15, and 17-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over alSafadi et al. (USPN 6,467,088, hereinafter “alSafadi”), in view of Henson et al. (USPN 6,167,383, hereinafter “Henson”).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 8, and 15 were rejected as being unpatentable over alSafadi in view of Henson. Applicant respectfully points out that the combined system of alSafadi and Henson teaches having the reconfiguration manager determine, based upon a list, a configuration to approve and to order (download) (see alSafadi, col. 2, lines 34-45). A **customer must then proceed** to an Internet website to select the desired options based on the selected configuration for purchase and to place the order (see Henson, col. 4, lines 36-39).

In contrast, the present invention **automatically initiates** the purchase transaction for a product. This involves **automatically directing** a web browser to a web site and then automatically navigating to a web page within the web site that deals with purchasing the product (see page 11, lines 1-5 of the instant application). Furthermore, the **system may communicate** information about the system being upgraded automatically to the web site (see page 11, lines 5-7 of the instant application). This is advantageous because it spares the user from having to spend time and effort navigating to the purchase website and manually re-entering information to complete the purchase process. Furthermore, it reduces the chances of an error being made during the purchasing process.

There is nothing within alSafadi or Henson, either separately or in concert, which suggests automatically initiating a purchase transaction. Furthermore, there is nothing within alSafadi or Henson, either separately or in concert, which

suggests automatically navigating to a product purchasing page and then automatically entering information to complete the transaction.


Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 8, and 15 to clarify that the present invention teaches automatically traversing a web site. This amendment finds support on page 11, lines 1-7 of the instant application

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 8, and 15 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 3-7, which depend upon claim 1, claims 10-14, which depend upon claim 8, and claims 17-21, which depend upon claim 15, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47, 615

Date: 10 January 2006

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95616
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665
Email: edward@parklegal.com